



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

59

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,026	12/14/2001	Glenn Darrell Batalden	ROC920010306US1	8987
7590	05/13/2005		EXAMINER	ZHOU, TING
Gero G. McClellan Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P. Suite 1500 3040 Post Oak Boulevard Houston, TX 77056-6582			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/020,026	BATALDEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ting Zhou	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 13 April 2005 have been received and entered. Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 12, 14-15, 20, 25-26, 28 and 32-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0054141 (hereinafter “Yen”).

Referring to claims 1, 14 and 25, Yen teaches a method, computer readable medium and computer comprising a memory containing at least a browser programming (computer system with storage executing an application program that displays browser windows for conducting online stock transactions) (page 2, paragraphs 0026-0027 and page 4, paragraph 0046); a processor which when executing the browser programming, is configured to: open a controlling browser window configured to control aspects of a controlled browser window (for example, the first main window display opens the first sub-window display, which is subordinate to, or controlled by the first main window display) (page 4, paragraphs 0047-0052), wherein the

controlling browser window is a hidden window and wherein the controlled browser window is a viewable window (each of the windows comprise a minimize and maximize function button, as shown in Figure 1; therefore, the first main window, or controlling window controlling the first sub-window can be minimized, or hidden) (page 2, paragraph 0026 and pages 2-3, paragraphs 0031); and open, from within the controlling browser window, the controlled browser window comprising a display area for rendering viewable content received from network locations (the first main window executes a launching object in the first window to open the first sub-window) (pages 2-3, paragraphs 0029-0032 and page 4, paragraphs 0047-0052), wherein the controlling browser window controls at least one of a graphical aspect of the opened controlled browser window and a functional aspect of the opened controlled browser window, during a browsing session engaged in by a user interacting with the controlled browser window (the first main window controls graphical and functional aspects of the first sub-window in that when the first main window shifts or closes, the first sub-window shifts or closes correspondingly) (page 4, paragraph 0052; this is further recited in pages 5-6, claim 1).

Referring to claim 34, Yen teaches a method comprising opening a browser program that opens a first browser window configured to open and display an HTML document (the application program 44 opens a HTML document window, such as a browser window for conducting on online stock transaction) (page 4, paragraph 0046), wherein the HTML document includes an executable component, which when processed by the browser program causes the browser program to open a second browser window (the first main window displaying the HTML online stock transaction content opens the first sub-window, i.e. second browser window, upon execution of the launching object in the first main window) (pages 2-3, paragraphs 0029-

0032 and page 4, paragraphs 0047-0052); and opening the second browser window, wherein the executable component of the first browser window is further configured to control at least one of a graphical aspect of the opened second browser window and a functional aspect of the second browser window, during the browsing session engaged in by a user interacting with the second browser window (the first main window controls graphical and functional aspects of the first sub-window in that when the first main window shifts or closes, the first sub-window shifts or closes correspondingly) (page 4, paragraph 0052; this is further recited in pages 5-6, claim 1).

Referring to claims 2, 15 and 26, Yen teaches the viewable content is Web content (the browser windows display information from a network, such as from the Internet, i.e. web content) (page 4, paragraph 0050 and page 5, paragraph 0061).

Referring to claims 4, 20 and 28, Yen teaches opening the controlling browser window comprises locking at least one of a keyboard key and a mouse key (windows are opened via operation of the input device, such as a mouse or a keyboard) (page 2, paragraph 0026).

Referring to claim 7, Yen teaches opening the controlling browser window comprises executing a browser control program comprising event handlers and wherein the method further comprises re-establishing the event handler for each change in a network address being accessed by the opened controlled browser program (the first main window, or controlling browser window comprises menu/function buttons, such as buttons 32 shown in Figures 3 and 4a-c; menu/function buttons are inherently designed with event handlers which handles subsequent processing each time the menu button is selected; for example, each time the user changes the network address by accessing a different web page via selecting one of the menu buttons, i.e. the

“back” and “forward” arrow buttons, the menu button event handler acts to handle the processing) (page 2, paragraph 0026).

Referring to claim 12, Yen teaches opening the controlled browser window comprises executing a controlled browser program and wherein opening the controlling browser window comprises executing a controlling browser program (the plurality of controlling and controlled browser windows, such as the first main window and first sub-window can be executed, or displayed by different application programs) (page 5, paragraph 0062).

Referring to claim 32, Yen teaches a network connection configured to support communications with the network locations via a network (computer system is linked to and communicates with the server via a network) (page 3, paragraph 0041 and page 4, paragraph 0050).

Referring to claim 33, Yen teaches the network is the Internet (the windows display Internet information and activities) (page 5, paragraph 0061).

Referring to claim 36, Yen teaches the executable component processed by the browser program renders the first browser window as a hidden window and the second browser window as a viewable window (each of the windows displayed by the application program comprise a minimize and maximize function button, as shown in Figure 1; therefore, the first main window, or controlling window controlling the first sub-window can be minimized, or hidden) (page 2, paragraph 0026 and pages 2-3, paragraphs 0031), and wherein the browsing activity engaged in by the user is restricted by the executable component (the application program restricts user’s browsing activity with linked sub-windows by controlling the closing of the first sub-window for

example, thereby preventing user browsing activity with the first sub-window) (page 3, paragraphs 0032-0033 and page 4, paragraphs 0048-0052).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 9-11, 17, 19, 21-24, 30-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable by Yen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0054141 (hereinafter "Yen"), as applied to claims 1, 14, 25 and 34 above, and Netscape® Communicator 4.75, copyright 2000 (hereinafter "Netscape").

Referring to claims 3, 17 and 35, Yen teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 14 and 34 above. However, although Yen teaches the controlling browser window controls operational and graphical aspects of the controlled browser window (the first main window controlling the displaying/closing and display location of the controlled first sub-window) (Yen: page 4, paragraph 0052), Yen fails to explicitly teach aspects of the controlled browser window to be controlled by the controlling browser window comprise at least one browser chrome element displayed by a graphical user interface displayed by the opened controlled browser window. Netscape teaches a graphical user interface that displays information received from the network, i.e. Internet, in browser windows (Netscape: Screenshots 2-3) similar to that of Yen. In

Art Unit: 2173

addition, Netscape further teaches aspects of the controlled browser window to be controlled by the controlling browser window comprise at least one browser chrome element displayed by a graphical user interface displayed by the opened controlled browser window (controlling at least one browser chrome element by deactivating the display of a portion of the chrome, i.e. some of the navigation buttons such as the “Back” and “Forward” buttons) (Netscape: Screenshot 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yen and Netscape before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of operational and graphical aspects of a browser window by another browser window of Yen to include the prevention of the display of a portion of the browser window taught by Netscape. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

Referring to claims 9, 22 and 30, Yen teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above. However, although Yen teaches the controlling browser window controls graphical aspects of the controlled browser window (the first main window controlling the display location of the controlled first sub-window) (Yen: page 4, paragraph 0052), Yen fails to explicitly teach opening the controlling browser window comprises preventing at least a portion of chrome of the opened controlled browser window from being displayed on an output device. Netscape teaches a graphical user interface that displays information received from the network, i.e. Internet, in browser windows (Netscape: Screenshots 2-3) similar to that of Yen. In addition, Netscape further teaches opening the controlling browser window comprises preventing at least a portion of chrome of the opened controlled browser window from being displayed on an output

device (deactivating the display of a portion of the chrome, i.e. some of the navigation buttons such as the “Back” and “Forward” buttons) (Netscape: Screenshot 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yen and Netscape before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of a browser window by another browser window of Yen to include the prevention of the display of a portion of the browser window taught by Netscape. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

Referring to claims 10, 23 and 31, Yen, as modified, teach the chrome of the opened controlled browser window comprises at least one of a tool bar, a menu bar, a title bar, an address field and a border (as shown in Figure 1, each of the displayed windows, including the displayed first main window and the first sub-window, comprises a tool bar, a menu bar, a title bar and a border).

Referring to claims 11 and 24, Yen, as modified, teach the controlling browser window comprises at least one of a tool bar, a menu bar, a title bar, an address field, and a border (as shown in Figure 1, each of the displayed windows, including the displayed first main window and the first sub-window, comprises a tool bar, a menu bar, a title bar and a border).

Referring to claim 19, Yen, as modified, teach opening the controlled browser window comprises executing a controlled browser program selected from one of Netscape Navigator® browser and Microsoft Internet Explorer® browser (screenshot 3 shows the web page displayed on a Netscape Navigator® browser).

Referring to claim 21, Yen, as modified, teach the controlling browser window is configured to restrict the browsing activity engaged in by the user by limiting access to at least one network address that is accessible by the opened controlled browser window (restrict browsing activity of the opened browser window, i.e. the “Google Business Solutions” window shown in Screenshot 3, by deactivating the display of a portion of the chrome, i.e. some of the navigation buttons such as the “Back” and “Forward” buttons, preventing those network addresses corresponding to the “Back” and “Forward” buttons from being accessed by the “Google Business Solutions” window) (Netscape: Screenshots 3-4).

4. . . Claims 8, 13, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yen et al. U.S. Publication 2002/0054141 (hereinafter “Yen”), as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above, and Hodgkinson U.S. Publication 2002/0016802.

Referring to claims 8, 18 and 27, Yen teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 1, 14 and 25 above. However, Yen fails to explicitly teach receiving user input to which the controlled browser program is configured to produce a response in a predetermined manner; and executing the controlling browser program to prevent the response in the predetermined manner and cause a response different from the predetermined manner. Hodgkinson teaches the display of user selected information received from a network such as the Internet (Hodgkinson: paragraphs 0001-0002 on page 1 and Figure 1), similar to that of Yen. In addition, Hodgkinson further teaches receiving user input to which the controlled browser program is configured to produce a response in a predetermined manner, and executing the controlling browser program to prevent the response in the predetermined manner and cause a response different from the

predetermined manner (upon receiving user selection requesting a change in the layout of the displayed webpage, instead of executing the change, the system prevents the browser from reformatting the pages) (Hodgkinson: paragraph 0015 on page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yen and Hodgkinson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of a browser window of Yen to include receiving an input and causing a response different than the predetermined response, taught by Hodgkinson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

Referring to claim 13, Yen teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 1 and 12 above. However, Yen fails to explicitly teach, in response to receiving user input configured to produce a first action by the opened controlled browser program, executing the controlling browser program to override the first action and produce a second action. Hodgkinson teaches the display of user selected information received from a network such as the Internet (Hodgkinson: paragraphs 0001-0002 on page 1 and Figure 1), similar to that of Yen. In addition, Hodgkinson further teaches in response to receiving user input configured to produce a first action by the opened controlled browser program, executing the controlling browser program to override the first action and produce a second action (upon receiving user selection requesting a change in the layout of the displayed webpage, instead of executing the change, the system prevents the browser from reformatting the pages) (Hodgkinson: paragraph 0015 on page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Yen and Hodgkinson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the control of a browser

window of Yen to include receiving an input and causing a response different than the predetermined response, taught by Hodgkinson. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide a management system that keeps users from conducting harmful or unauthorized actions on data, maintaining data integrity and security.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-28 and 30-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2173

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-4058.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173